Health Canada Santé Canada

Departmental Program Evaluation Division

Division de l'évaluation des programmes ministérielle

Applied Research and Analysis Directorate

Direction de la recherche appliquée et de l'analyse

Information, Analysis, and Connectivity Branch

Direction générale de l'information, de l'analyse et de la connectivité

Management Council 2000 Evaluation Report

"Pulling Together to Transform Health Canada"

October 2000

Canada

Our mission is to help the people of Canada maintain and improve their health.

Health Canada

Notre mission est d'aider les Canadiens et les Canadiennes à maintenir et à ameliorer leur état de santé.

Santé Canada

The Departmental Program Evaluation Division provides objective information and advice on policy and program performance and works to strengthen departmental performance measurement and evaluation capacity in order to enhance the impact of Health Canada's activities on the health of the people of Canada.

La Division de l'évaluation des programmes ministérielle offre de l'information et des conseils objectifs sur le rendement des politiques et des programmes et s'efforce de renforcer la capacité du Ministère à mesurer et à évaluer le rendement afin d'accroître l'impact des activités de Santé Canada sur la santé de la population canadienne.

104-00991/

This report was originally prepared in English and translated into French. Although the quality of the translation of this document has been reviewed, because of the use of technical and methodological terminology, please note that in the event of any difference of interpretation in the two languages, the English language version should take precedence.

Prepared by Geoff Cole and Carol Long
Departmental Program Evaluation Division
Applied Research and Analysis Directorate
Information, Analysis and Connectivity Branch
Health Canada

October 2000

Table of Contents

Executive Summary iii

Evaluation Findings 1

Appendix A: Evaluation Methods 7

Appendix B: Management Council 2000 Evaluation Questionnaire 9

Appendix C: Summary of Questionnaire Data 15

Appendix D: Summary of Questionnaire Comments 29

Executive Summary

Health Canada held its eighth annual Management Council - *"Pulling Together to Transform Health Canada"* - on September 18-19, 2000, at the Château Cartier in Aymer, Quebec.

Its objectives were:

- to provide information on the elements of transformation/realignment;
- to increase understanding of the elements of transformation; and
- to provide an opportunity to get to know colleagues.

Three hundred and six participants attended Management Council 2000. Of those who attended, 234 completed questionnaires. This response rate of 76% is considerably higher than the 47% who responded last year.

Respondents indicated that:

- eighty-eight percent felt Management Council is worthwhile and should be continued;
- the objectives of Management Council were clear, but opinion on whether or not the objectives were achieved varied. Forty-one percent felt that the Management Council provided information on or increased understanding of transformation;
- Management Council provided an opportunity to network and to get to know colleagues, and
- "heavy" subjects should be dealt with on day one and long plenary presentations should not be held late in the day.

Based on the evaluation the following is recommended:

- there must be more information provided to employees on the elements and next steps of Transformation;
- team building exercises should be held throughout the year;
- proceedings from Management Council 2000 should be made available to all Health Canada staff; and
- Management Council should be held again next year.

Evaluation Findings

Introduction

Health Canada held its eighth annual Management Council - *Pulling Together to Transform Health Canada* - on September 18-19, 2000, at the Château Cartier in Alymer, Quebec.

Its objectives were:

- to provide information on the elements of transformation/realignment;
- to increase understanding of the elements of transformation; and
- to provide an opportunity to get to know colleagues.

Three hundred and six participants attended Management Council 2000. Of those who attended, 234 completed questionnaires. This response rate of 76% is considerably higher than the 47% who responded last year. Thirty-six percent of the Management Council 2000 respondents did not attend Management Council 1999.

This report summarises Management Council 2000 evaluation findings. The main findings are grouped into three broad categories: objectives and outcomes, structure and organization, and overall assessments. Further detail and references are contained in the Appendices. The findings from Management Council 1999 are provided throughout this report as a basis for comparison.

Objectives and Outcomes of Management Council

Most of the respondents felt that the objectives of Management Council were clear, but the opinion as to whether or not the objectives were achieved varied. For example, less than half (40%) felt that the Management Council provided information on or increased understanding of transformation. Based on this, the Department might want to consider regular updates on transformation activities to all staff.

The Management Council is an excellent opportunity for Health Canada managers to learn about their colleagues and their work. Eighty-eight percent of respondents felt that Management Council succeeded in this objective. Although the objectives of the Management Council 1999 and Management Council 2000 are not directly comparable, it is interesting to note the respondents opinions as to whether or not the objectives were met. All numbers are in percentages.

Table 1: Were the Objectives of Management Council Achieved?

Management Council 1999	
Objective	**Yes**
The MC provided an opportunity for input into the DM's strategic directions	48
The MC identified activities to achieve strategic objectives.	43
The MC set-out the key elements of a plan to move forward on the objectives.	28

Management Council 2000	
Objective	**Yes**
MC provided information on transformation/ realignment	40
MC increased understanding of transformation.	37
MC provided opportunity to get to know colleagues	88

A majority of the respondents felt that the Management Council had contributed to team building and improved internal communications. Health Canada should continue to build on the successes of past Management Councils. Some respondents indicated that these benefits could reach further if those attending Management Council included other Health Canada staff. To more fully enhance the benefits of team building managers should be encouraged to provide similar activities year round. This will have positive effects on the daily work of Health Canada managers and their staff.

Table 2 displays the percentage of people who indicated that expected Management Council outcomes were achieved.

Table 2: Comparison of Expected Management Council Outcomes

	Management Council 1999	Management Council 2000
Management Council had strengthened or expanded individual departmental networks	75	88
Management Council contributed to team building	71	68
Management Council contributed to improved internal communications	81	58
Management Council will contribute to managers being more effective	64	58

Table 1: Were the Objectives of Management Council Achieved?

Management Council 1999	
Objective	**Yes**
The MC provided an opportunity for input into the DM's strategic directions	48
The MC identified activities to achieve strategic objectives.	43
The MC set-out the key elements of a plan to move forward on the objectives.	28

Management Council 2000	
Objective	**Yes**
MC provided information on transformation/ realignment	40
MC increased understanding of transformation.	37
MC provided opportunity to get to know colleagues	88

A majority of the respondents felt that the Management Council had contributed to team building and improved internal communications. Health Canada should continue to build on the successes of past Management Councils. Some respondents indicated that these benefits could reach further if those attending Management Council included other Health Canada staff. To more fully enhance the benefits of team building managers should be encouraged to provide similar activities year round. This will have positive effects on the daily work of Health Canada managers and their staff.

Table 2 displays the percentage of people who indicated that expected Management Council outcomes were achieved.

Table 2: Comparison of Expected Management Council Outcomes

	Management Council 1999	**Management Council 2000**
Management Council had strengthened or expanded individual departmental networks	75	88
Management Council contributed to team building	71	68
Management Council contributed to improved internal communications	81	58
Management Council will contribute to managers being more effective	64	58

According to respondents, Management Council 1999 was slightly more effective than Management Council 2000 at contributing to these outcomes. The comparatively lower ratings for some outcomes for Management Council 2000 is surprising considering the agenda was targeted more toward these results. Furthermore, respondents indicated that the agenda items which were designed to achieve these outcomes were effective. The differences may be attributed to the higher response rate.

Structure and Organization of Management Council

The structure and organization of Management Council received positive ratings. Respondents' comments also indicate that there was a good balance of social events, workshops and plenaries. When comparing the positive to negative responses of other aspects of Management Council this finding is further supported.

- A majority (65%) of the respondents were satisfied with the format of the Management Council, while 6% were not. Twenty-nine percent provided a neutral response.
- A majority (58%) of the respondents felt there was enough time (90 minutes) allocated for discussion and questions, while 16% felt there was not enough time. Twenty-six percent provided a neutral response.
- A majority (79%) of the respondents felt the Management Council was well organized, while 6% felt it was not well organized. Fifteen percent provided a neutral response.
- A majority (76%) of the respondents were satisfied with the hotel facilities, while 10% were not. Fourteen percent provided a neutral response.
- A majority (71%) of the respondents were satisfied with the use of official languages, while 10% were not. Nineteen percent provided a neutral response.

Please see Table 3 for a comparison of Management Council logistics. Please note only the positive and negative responses are reflected below. All numbers are in percentages.

Table 3: Comparison of Management Council Logistics

Logistical Components	Management Council 1999		Management Council 2000	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Satisfied with the format of Management Council.	56	14	64	6
There was enough time allocated for discussions/ questions.	27	46	58	16
Satisfied with the facilities*	85	5	76	10
Satisfied with use of official languages	61	13	71	9

* Note: Management Council 1999 was held at the Weston, downtown Ottawa. Management Council 2000 was held at the Château Cartier, Alymer, Quebec.

In most cases less than half of the respondents rated the workshops and plenary presentations positively. On average 19% rated the workshop and plenary presentations negatively, 37% felt they were neither good nor bad, and 44% rated them positively. Only 13% of respondents had a negative opinion of the Risk Management workshop and only 16% respondents had a negative opinion of the Strategic Planning workshop.

The success of the workshops depends greatly on the facilitator and the personalities participating. Some respondents indicated that the workshop topics were interesting, well organized and well facilitated, while others felt that the topics were abstract, poorly organized and poorly facilitated. Regardless of individual experiences within the workshops, they provide a forum for networking, brainstorming and information exchange.

Comments indicated that the plenary presentations provided useful information that reinforced a common management understanding. Comments, however, also indicated that most managers already understood these issues and the plenary presentations, therefore, were not a good use of time. In the future, information on topics like these may be better addressed in another format.

Table 3: Comparison of Management Council Logistics

Logistical Components	Management Council 1999		Management Council 2000	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Satisfied with the format of Management Council.	56	14	64	6
There was enough time allocated for discussions/ questions.	27	46	58	16
Satisfied with the facilities*	85	5	76	10
Satisfied with use of official languages	61	13	71	9

* Note: Management Council 1999 was held at the Weston, downtown Ottawa. Management Council 2000 was held at the Château Cartier, Alymer, Quebec.

In most cases less than half of the respondents rated the workshops and plenary presentations positively. On average 19% rated the workshop and plenary presentations negatively, 37% felt they were neither good nor bad, and 44% rated them positively. Only 13% of respondents had a negative opinion of the Risk Management workshop and only 16% respondents had a negative opinion of the Strategic Planning workshop.

The success of the workshops depends greatly on the facilitator and the personalities participating. Some respondents indicated that the workshop topics were interesting, well organized and well facilitated, while others felt that the topics were abstract, poorly organized and poorly facilitated. Regardless of individual experiences within the workshops, they provide a forum for networking, brainstorming and information exchange.

Comments indicated that the plenary presentations provided useful information that reinforced a common management understanding. Comments, however, also indicated that most managers already understood these issues and the plenary presentations, therefore, were not a good use of time. In the future, information on topics like these may be better addressed in another format.

If the objective of future Management Councils is to engage the participants through workshops and plenary presentations, the participants should be interested in the topics. When selecting future Management Council workshop and plenary topics, the Steering Committee should consider soliciting input from participants. In addition, some respondents recommended that the "heavier" subjects be dealt with on day one and that long plenary presentations should not be held late in the day.

A majority (75%) of the respondents felt that the remarks of the Deputy Minister and Associate Deputy Minister were informative. The comments received indicated that it is helpful to understand the Deputy Ministerial perspective on current issues, but more detail on the meaning and direction of transformation would have been useful. In order to stimulate more discussion, it was suggested that, in future, the audience submit questions to the Deputy Minister and Associate Deputy Minister on cue cards. This may remove any apprehension to question senior management in an open forum. Also, in future Management Councils, Departmental Executive Committee members must be more visible.

Overall Assessment

A majority of the respondents believe that Management Council is worthwhile and should be held again.

The respondents indicated that the objectives of Management Council were clear and progress has been made toward their achievement. Although key transformation messages were delivered at Management Council, the survey responses indicate that more work needs to be done communicating the meaning and next steps of transformation. To facilitate the development of a common understanding of transformation in the Department, proceedings from Management Council 2000 should be made available to all employees.

Respondents indicated that Management Council provided an opportunity to get to know their colleagues and will help to strengthen departmental networks, contribute to team building and improve internal communications.

Even though there were some low ratings on some elements of Management Council (for example, the workshops and plenary session) the evaluation indicates that the participants were satisfied with the event. There was a good balance among the many aspects of this Management Council. The bingo, fitness breaks and other social events were highlights that complemented the discussions. Management Council participants continue to expect creative and stimulating activities and discussions.

At the next Management Council the workshops should remain 90 minutes, there should be a balanced use of both official languages and the event should be held at the Château Cartier. The bingo, health breaks and other social events should be continued.

To improve participants' opinion of future Management Councils the workshop and plenary component could be strengthened. This could be done by selecting more engaging workshop and plenary topics and using more experienced facilitators. As always there is room to improve, but the respondents indicated that this Council was an improvement over previous Councils.

Appendix A: Evaluation Methods

The Departmental Program Evaluation Division (DPED), Information Analysis and Connectivity Branch, developed a questionnaire (see Appendix B) as the data source for this evaluation study. Each delegate was provided an evaluation questionnaire. Copies were also available during and after the Council.

DPED tallied and analysed the results of the questionnaires. Respondents were asked to rate the Council elements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the extreme negative rating and 5 the extreme positive rating. Ratings of 1 or 2 were considered negative responses, a rating of 3 was considered a neutral response and ratings of 4 or 5, positive responses. These scores were re-coded so that 1 represents a negative response, 2 represents a neutral response and 3 represents a positive response. A summary of the re-coded data is presented in Appendix C. Respondents demonstrated great enthusiasm and offered many comments, which are summarize in Appendix D.

Three hundred and six participants attended the Management Council 2000, 234 of them completed questionnaires. This response rate of 76% can be considered representative of the participants' views. Of those who responded 36% did not attend Management Council 1999. In 1999, 47% of the participants completed questionnaires and in 1998, 55% of the participants completed questionnaires. Please see the Table 1 below for a comparison.

Table 1: Comparison of Response Rates From the 1998 - 2000 Management Councils

	Total Respondents	Percentage of Participants
Management Council 2000	234	76%
Management Council 1999	128	47%
Management Council 1998	103	55%

The response rate this year is significantly higher than in previous years and this may be due to the fact that the questionnaire was shorter, a gift was provided to those who returned their questionnaire at the end of the Council and the high number of new participants.

Appendix A: Evaluation Methods

The Departmental Program Evaluation Division (DPED), Information Analysis and Connectivity Branch, developed a questionnaire (see Appendix B) as the data source for this evaluation study. Each delegate was provided an evaluation questionnaire. Copies were also available during and after the Council.

DPED tallied and analysed the results of the questionnaires. Respondents were asked to rate the Council elements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the extreme negative rating and 5 the extreme positive rating. Ratings of 1 or 2 were considered negative responses, a rating of 3 was considered a neutral response and ratings of 4 or 5, positive responses. These scores were re-coded so that 1 represents a negative response, 2 represents a neutral response and 3 represents a positive response. A summary of the re-coded data is presented in Appendix C. Respondents demonstrated great enthusiasm and offered many comments, which are summarize in Appendix D.

Three hundred and six participants attended the Management Council 2000, 234 of them completed questionnaires. This response rate of 76% can be considered representative of the participants' views. Of those who responded 36% did not attend Management Council 1999. In 1999, 47% of the participants completed questionnaires and in 1998, 55% of the participants completed questionnaires. Please see the Table 1 below for a comparison.

Table 1: Comparison of Response Rates From the 1998 - 2000 Management Councils

	Total Respondents	Percentage of Participants
Management Council 2000	234	76%
Management Council 1999	128	47%
Management Council 1998	103	55%

The response rate this year is significantly higher than in previous years and this may be due to the fact that the questionnaire was shorter, a gift was provided to those who returned their questionnaire at the end of the Council and the high number of new participants.

Appendix B: Management Council 2000 Evaluation Questionnaire

Message From the Deputy Minister and the Associate Deputy Minister

Each year the Management Council is evaluated in an attempt to identify its impact and ways it can be improved in the future. Your opinions are valued and we would like to know what you thought about this Management Council.

Your responses will be kept confidential and will be consolidated and summarized by the Departmental Program Evaluation Division, Applied Research and Analysis Directorate, Information, Analysis and Connectivity Branch. The final report will be distributed electronically to all Management Council participants.

Once completed, could you please deposit your evaluation questionnaire in the designated collection box, as indicated by the Management Council facilitator. When you return your questionnaire you will receive an "Unlock your block" motivating desktop puzzle.

In the event that you are not able to complete this questionnaire at the Management Council, please send it to:

Departmental Program Evaluation Division
Applied Research and Analysis Directorate
Information, Analysis and Connectivity Branch
7th Floor, Brooke Claxton Building
Postal Locator 0907D
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K9

Fax: 952-9660

We look forward to receiving your input.

Sincerely,

David A. Dodge *Marie E. Fortier*

2000 Management Council Evaluation Questionnaire

Please respond to each question. The following questions are rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the extreme negative rating and 5, being the extreme positive rating. Ratings of 1 or 2 are considered negative responses, a rating of 3 is considered a neutral response (not good or bad) and ratings of 4 or 5, are considered positive responses.

1. **The Management Council objectives were clear.**

   Not at all clear — Very clear

   1 2 3 4 5 No Opinion ☐

2. **The Management Council provided information on the elements of transformation/realignment.**

   Not at all — Definitely

   1 2 3 4 5 No Opinion ☐

3. **The Management Council increased your understanding of the elements of transformation.**

   Not at all — Definitely

   1 2 3 4 5 No Opinion ☐

4. **The Management Council provided an opportunity for you to get to know your colleagues (i.e. strengthened/expanded your departmental network).**

   Not at all — Definitely

   1 2 3 4 5 No Opinion ☐

5. **The Management Council will contribute to team building/increased collaboration within the Department.**

   Not at all — Definitely

   1 2 3 4 5 No Opinion ☐

6. **The Management Council will contribute to improved internal communication within the Department.**

   Not at all — Definitely

   1 2 3 4 5 No Opinion ☐

7. The Management Council will contribute to your being a more effective Health Canada manager.

Not at all — Definitely

1 2 3 4 5 No Opinion ☐

8. How worthwhile were the Day 1 workshops?

	Not at all				Definitely	
a. Leadership in Action	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐
b. Science Capacity	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐
c. Pulling Together	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

9. How worthwhile were the Day 2 workshops?

	Not at all				Definitely	
a. Risk Management	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐
b. Strategic Planning	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

10. How worthwhile were the plenary presentations?

	Not at all				Definitely	
a. Embracing Change	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐
b. *Official Languages Act*	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐
c. Modern Comptrollership	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐
d. Workplace Health	1	2	3	4	5	Did not attend ☐

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

11. **The remarks of the Deputy Minister and the Associate Deputy Minister were informative.**

	Not at all				Definitely	
a. Opening remarks/priorities	1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion ☐
b. Questions and Answers	1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion ☐

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

12. **You were satisfied with the format of the Management Council.**

Not at all				Definitely	
1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion ☐

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

13. **There was enough time allocated for discussion/questions at the Management Council.**

Not at all				Definitely	
1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion ☐

14. **How satisfied were you with:**

	Not at all				Definitely	
a. the organization of the Council	1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion ☐
b. the hotel facilities	1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion ☐
c. use of official languages	1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion ☐

15. **The Management Council is worthwhile.**

Not at all			Definitely		
1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion ☐

16. **What was most valuable about this Management Council?**

_____

_____

_____

17. What was least valuable about this Management Council?

_____

_____

_____

_____

18. What is your overall assessment of this year's Management Council compared to last year's?

Better ☐ Same ☐ Worse ☐ Did not attend last year ☐ No Opinion ☐

19. How would you make the next Management Council better?

_____

_____

_____

Additional Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU!

Appendix C: Summary of Questionnaire Data

Question 1: The Management Council objectives were clear.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	13	5.6	5.7	5.7
	Neutral	47	20.1	20.4	26.1
	Positive	170	72.6	73.9	100.0
	Total	230	98.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	2	.9		
	No opinion	2	.9		
	Total	4	1.7		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 2: The Management Council provided information on the elements of transformation/realignment.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	39	16.7	17.1	17.1
	Neutral	96	41.0	42.1	59.2
	Positive	93	39.7	40.8	100.0
	Total	228	97.4	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	5	2.1		
	No opinion	1	.4		
	Total	6	2.6		
Total		234	100.0		

Appendix C: Summary of Questionnaire Data

Question 1: The Management Council objectives were clear.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	13	5.6	5.7	5.7
	Neutral	47	20.1	20.4	26.1
	Positive	170	72.6	73.9	100.0
	Total	230	98.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	2	.9		
	No opinion	2	.9		
	Total	4	1.7		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 2: The Management Council provided information on the elements of transformation/realignment.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	39	16.7	17.1	17.1
	Neutral	96	41.0	42.1	59.2
	Positive	93	39.7	40.8	100.0
	Total	228	97.4	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	5	2.1		
	No opinion	1	.4		
	Total	6	2.6		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 3: The Management Council increased your understanding of the elements of transformation.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	44	18.8	19.7	19.7
	Neutral	93	39.7	41.7	61.4
	Positive	86	36.8	38.6	100.0
	Total	223	95.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	10	4.3		
	No opinion	1	.4		
	Total	11	4.7		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 4: The management Council provided and opportunity for you to get to know your colleagues (i.e. strengthened/expanded your departmental network).

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	4	1.7	1.7	1.7
	Neutral	24	10.3	10.4	12.1
	Positive	203	86.8	87.9	100.0
	Total	231	98.7	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	2	.9		
	No opinion	1	.4		
	Total	3	1.3		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 5: The Management Council will contribute to team building/increased collaboration within the Department.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	12	5.1	5.3	5.3
	Neutral	59	25.2	26.2	31.6
	Positive	154	65.8	68.4	100.0
	Total	225	96.2	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	5	2.1		
	No opinion	4	1.7		
	Total	9	3.8		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 6: The Management Council will contribute to improved internal communication within the Department.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	22	9.4	9.8	9.8
	Neutral	72	30.8	32.1	42.0
	Positive	130	55.6	58.0	100.0
	Total	224	95.7	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	5	2.1		
	No opinion	5	2.1		
	Total	10	4.3		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 7: The Management Council will contribute to your being a more effective Health Canada manager.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	22	9.4	10.0	10.0
	Neutral	71	30.3	32.1	42.1
	Positive	128	54.7	57.9	100.0
	Total	221	94.4	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	6	2.6		
	No opinion	7	3.0		
	Total	13	5.6		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 8a: How worthwhile were the Day 1 workshops? Leadership in Action

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	32	13.7	22.1	22.1
	Neutral	53	22.6	36.6	58.6
	Positive	60	25.6	41.4	100.0
	Total	145	62.0	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	16	6.8		
	No opinion	73	31.2		
	Total	89	38.0		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 8b: How worthwhile were the Day 1 workshops? Science Capacity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	13	5.6	12.5	12.5
	Neutral	40	17.1	38.5	51.0
	Positive	51	21.8	49.0	100.0
	Total	104	44.4	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	26	11.1		
	No opinion	1	.4		
	Did not attend	103	44.0		
	Total	130	55.6		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 8c: How worthwhile were the Day 1 workshops? Pulling Together

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	30	12.8	18.4	18.4
	Neutral	56	23.9	34.4	52.8
	Positive	77	32.9	47.2	100.0
	Total	163	69.7	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	12	5.1		
	Did notattend	59	25.2		
	Total	71	30.3		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 9a: How worthwhile were the Day 2 workshops? Risk Management

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	26	11.1	12.9	12.9
	Neutral	68	29.1	33.7	46.5
	Positive	108	46.2	53.5	100.0
	Total	202	86.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	12	5.1		
	Did not attend	20	8.5		
	Total	32	13.7		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 9b: How worthwhile were the Day 2 workshops? Strategic Planning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	32	13.7	16.4	16.4
	Neutral	76	32.5	39.0	55.4
	Positive	87	37.2	44.6	100.0
	Total	195	83.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	20	8.5		
	Did not attend	19	8.1		
	Total	39	16.7		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 10a: How worthwhile were the plenary presentations? Embracing Change

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	40	17.1	19.5	19.5
	Neutral	68	29.1	33.2	52.7
	Positive	97	41.5	47.3	100.0
	Total	205	87.6	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	8	3.4		
	Did not attend	21	9.0		
	Total	29	12.4		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 10b: How worthwhile were the plenary presentations? *Official Languages Act*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	43	18.4	21.7	21.7
	Neutral	69	29.5	34.8	56.6
	Positive	86	36.8	43.4	100.0
	Total	198	84.6	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	9	3.8		
	Did not attend	27	11.5		
	Total	36	15.4		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 10c: How worthwhile were the plenary presentations? Modern Comptrollership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	60	25.6	32.3	32.3
	Neutral	73	31.2	39.2	71.5
	Positive	53	22.6	28.5	100.0
	Total	186	79.5	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	14	6.0		
	Did not attend	34	14.5		
	Total	48	20.5		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 10d: How worthwhile were the plenary presentations? Workplace Health

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	30	12.8	16.0	16.0
	Neutral	73	31.2	38.8	54.8
	Positive	85	36.3	45.2	100.0
	Total	188	80.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	16	6.8		
	Did not attend	30	12.8		
	Total	46	19.7		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 11a: The remarks of the Deputy Minister and the Associate Deputy Minister were informative. Opening remarks/priorities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	12	5.1	5.5	5.5
	Neutral	45	19.2	20.6	26.1
	Positive	161	68.8	73.9	100.0
	Total	218	93.2	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	8	3.4		
	No opinion	7	3.0		
	Did not attend	1	0.4		
	Total	16	6.8		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 11b: The remarks of the Deputy Minister and the Associate Deputy Minister were informative. Questions and Answers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	11	4.7	6.0	6.0
	Neutral	37	15.8	20.1	26.1
	Positive	136	58.1	73.9	100.0
	Total	184	78.6	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	37	15.8		
	No opinion	11	4.7		
	Did not attend	2	.9		
	Total	50	21.4		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 12: You were satisfied with the format of the Management Council.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	14	6.0	6.2	6.2
	Neutral	66	28.2	29.3	35.6
	Positive	145	62.0	64.4	100.0
	Total	225	96.2	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	8	3.4		
	No opinion	1	.4		
	Total	9	3.8		
Total		234	100.0		

Questions 13: There was enough time allocated for discussion/ questions at the Management Council.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	35	15.0	16.0	16.0
	Neutral	56	23.9	25.6	41.6
	Positive	128	54.7	58.4	100.0
	Total	219	93.6	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	13	5.6		
	No opinion	2	.9		
	Total	15	6.4		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 14a: How satisfied were you with: The organization of the Council.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	14	6.0	6.3	6.3
	Neutral	33	14.1	14.8	21.1
	Positive	176	75.2	78.9	100.0
	Total	223	95.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	7	3.0		
	No opinion	4	1.7		
	Total	11	4.7		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 14b: How satisfied were you with: The hotel facilities.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	21	9.0	10.2	10.2
	Neutral	29	12.4	14.1	24.3
	Positive	156	66.7	75.7	100.0
	Total	206	88.0	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	8	3.4		
	No opinion	19	8.1		
	Did not attend	1	.4		
	Total	28	12.0		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 14c: How satisfied were you with: Use of official languages.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	21	9.0	9.8	9.8
	Neutral	42	17.9	19.5	29.3
	Positive	152	65.0	70.7	100.0
	Total	215	91.9	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	7	3.0		
	No opinion	12	5.1		
	Total	19	8.1		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 15: The Management Council is worthwhile.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Negative	12	5.1	5.3	5.3
	Neutral	36	15.4	15.9	21.2
	Positive	178	76.1	78.8	100.0
	Total	226	96.6	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	6	2.6		
	No opinion	2	.9		
	Total	8	3.4		
Total		234	100.0		

Question 18: What is your overall assessment of this year's Management Council compared to last year?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Better	49	20.9	43.8	43.8
	Same	48	20.5	42.9	86.6
	Worse	15	6.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	112	47.9	100.0	
Missing	Did not answer	29	12.4		
	No opinion	10	4.3		
	Did not attend last year	83	35.5		
	Total	122	52.1		
Total		234	100.0		

Appendix D: Summary of Questionnaire Comments

Positive Comments on Work Shops

- Good cross-fertilisation. First opportunity to formally discuss these issues
- Good opportunity for informative discussion.
- It is always comforting to see that we are all sharing the same concerns and, together, we can influence and change to embrace the necessary changes required.
- Workshops gave me a chance to voice my opinion and provided me with new information.
- Excellent brainstorming - what a great way to gather corporate intelligence together!

Negative Comments on Work Shops

- These workshops were problem-stating sessions and very frustrating. We revisited old ground and creativity was lacking.
- Not well structured; lacking focus...Heard this stuff before.
- The facilitators were not provided with sufficient info that will help them lead the discussion to achieve the goal.
- Very interesting but quite abstract.

Positive Comments on Plenary Presentations

- I was already aware of most of this information, but it is worthwhile to the be reminded.
- Helpful for reiterating where we are and where we need to go.
- Useful background information.

Negative Comments on Plenary Presentations

- Too long at the end of an already long day.
- Little new info
- Very dull. Could have read this material and used the time more productively.
- A lot of preaching to the converted

Positive Comments on DM's Remarks

- We need more opportunities like this to hear from our leaders.
- It is always helpful to have the big picture assessment and to hear the latest thinking on priority issues and how we are responding as an organization.
- Am always impressed by their openness and willingness to have the tough issues/discussions they face. A change from previous DMs!
- Time with the Deputies is always useful especially when dealing with departmental directions and priorities. The Deputies are providing enormous leadership for the dept.
- Always helpful to understand the Deputy level perspective on current issues.

Negative Comments on DM's Remarks

- We needed to hear more detail around transformation and realignment challenges.
- Not much new.

Positive Comments on Format

- Good mix of plenary, breakout.
- Good balance of workshops, plenary sessions, and social events.
- I think it was an excellent format and conducive for discussions, learning, coming together, and direction for the future.

Negative Comments on Format

- Not enough time at workshops, too many people involved at the same time.
- Format: OK. Content: subjects were appropriate, content was weak.

What is most valuable

- Interaction with and getting perspectives of colleagues, particularly regional colleagues.
- Exchange of ideas and interaction with colleagues from other parts of the department.
- Interaction with others. Ability to hear issues and debate in one spot with other managers.
- Updates from DMs. Networking, business interaction.
- Networking. Information sharing. The Minister's Speech - motivational

What is least Valuable

- "Not enough" discussion about the challenges/issues which have arisen/are arising in the re-alignment process
- Plenaries on day 1.
- Bingo...
- Nothing - excellent.

How would you make the next Management Council Better?

- Allow more time to break our sessions. Put topics like "pulling together" on second day and put weightier subjects on first day. Allow more discussion time.
- More time on single issues. No time for motherhood stuff - Visible Minorities, *Official Languages Act*, etc.
- Fewer topics and more detail.
- Invite a mix of attendants - more junior managers/employees.
- Have all DEC members visibly participate.
- Have guest speakers from corporate/university sectors to speak on themes for next MC
- Make it a one-day event.

Other Comments

- Please make all information (agenda, background documents, presentation materials, council "outputs" - as was said reports) available on Lotus Notes for all staff to access. Do not wait until they are all available, but post a shell and add the documents as they come available if not already given to the secretariat.
- Fitness Activities were great!
- This event was very well organized! The facilities and hotel support were excellent! Catering and meals were delicious! Management Council organizers should be congratulated! Secretariat staff were very diligent in their responsibilities! "Pats" on the back all around!